

- 1) Question - Since one of the goals is to transfer related AMRFC technology and if you (an offeror) were not involved in the current AMRFC program, should you propose to the RFP?

Response – Yes, one of the MFEW/ES program priorities is to compete technologies and technology providers capable of achieving the programs goals.

- 2) Question – Will the programs Systems Development and Demonstration (SDD) phase be subject to a subsequent competition?

Answer – The current RFP is designed to award basic multiple IDIQ contracts that allow competition for task orders between basic contract awardees from the Technology Development (TD) phase through the SDD phase and Low Rate Initial Production (LRIP). The current accelerated schedule will allow the program to advance through the SDD phase under this RFP. The goal is to provide a smooth transfer from TD phase under ONR to SDD under NAVSEA direct management. NAVSEA may elect a follow-on RFP to procure all or some portion of the SDD phase effort as needed depending on changing priorities and progress under the TD phase.

- 3) Question – Will potential offerors be able to obtain copies of the briefing materials presented at Industry Day?

Answer - Yes, direct requests to MFEW/ES RFP PCO, Mr. Wade Wargo ONR 251, via email at wargow@onr.navy.mil. If you are in need of the Technology Transition Agreement (TTA) or copy of the classified material presented at Industry Day please indicate in your email request and provide request no later than 08 JUN 2004 to assure adequate time for receipt of materials. Only potential offerors that possess a SECRET facility clearance with SECRET safeguarding will be able to obtain copies of the TTA and classified briefs.

- 4) Question – Are there specific RCS requirements for the MFEW/ES system?

Answer – Not yet, we are awaiting specific RCS requirements flow-down from the DD(X) Program Office. These requirements will be provided to basic contract awardees at the time of solicitation for the initial developmental task orders.

- 5) Question – Are there available ICD, RCS, and API guides for the current Navy hardware and will these be provided to industry.

Answer – The ICD and API guides do exist in draft version, but will not be provided during this proposal generation phase. These documents will be updated and provided to basic contract awardees at the time of solicitation for the initial developmental task orders. The question regarding RCS information is answered in number 4) above.

- 6) Question – Does an offeror need to propose to or address all six RFP sample tasks in their proposal in order to be considered for a basic contract award? And, if a contractor is capable of performing more than one of the six sample tasks, is there a benefit to responding to more than one sample task?

Answer – Each offeror must propose to at least one sample task. The offeror will however receive a higher technical rating to the extent in which it can demonstrate an understanding, the requisite capabilities, and approach (IAW Section M.1.I.A.(1)) for a complete system as described by the five development sample tasks. However, the Government reserves the right to provide a high rating under the relevant factors/subfactors for a proposal that, rather than proposing a full system solution, provides for a niche capability not demonstrated by the other offerors. The Government also reserves the right to provide for a high rating to offerors proposing only to provide the system integrator/system engineer (Sample Task iv) work under this RFP.

- 7) Question - If a bidder only selects one Sample Task to demonstrate its capabilities, will the awardee be restricted to providing proposals only for task orders that are related to that sample task?

Answer - No.

- 8) Question – Has a cost estimate been developed for MFEW/ES during the different developmental phases? And, has ONR determined a “Point of Departure” cost for AMRF-C?

Answer – Initial cost estimates for this project have been generated but will not be provided.

- 9) Question – Can you elaborate on Section L.17 Task 0001?
- Is this task to be proposed as FFP or LPLOE at NTE \$75K?
 - We understand that the effort is to propose 2 * 8 * 4 man-days; What additional support people (Contracts, PMO, Finance) are to be included in the estimate?
 - How should an offeror identify and detail the labor mix for the task order 0001 cost proposal as required in the RFP?

Answer – This effort is to be proposed as FFP. The “Section B” of the task order will show CLINs/SLINs for each person or labor category with a certain number of meetings times a per meeting charge. This per meeting charge can include a level of effort up to 4 person-days as shown in Section L.17. Only up to two people shall be proposed for attending each meeting. (However, each meeting could have different people/categories proposed to cover the appropriate technical discussions.) With that said it would be expected that only the two persons/categories proposed for each meeting would be identified and charged direct. However, if an offeror’s accounting system charges certain labor categories direct that are commonly considered indirect

labor (e.g., Pricing, Contracts, etc), these items may also be included in the cost proposal. In this case, the offeror must still provide a price per meeting/attendee even though this price will represent not only the costs for the person attending the meeting but also the costs for these other labor costs commonly considered as indirect items. Concerning hours for a Program Manager for this order, the Government does not require level of effort proposed for a Program Manager under this effort. If the Contractor desires to propose a Program Manager's time, the specified level of effort in the RFP of up to four days (1-day meeting with up to 3 days preparation/post meeting action) per meeting per attendee should still not be exceeded. This means that the total level of effort for the attendee's preparation/post meeting action and program management time can not exceed 3 days per meeting. The Task Order 0001 Cost Proposal shall not to exceed a FFP Amount of \$75,000.

- 10) Question – If one or more companies enter into teaming arrangements for the purpose of proposing to this RFP should they submit separate proposals?

Answer – A “teaming” arrangement is not a contractually recognized term. This means that under the proposal the Government will recognize one entity when awarding the contract. If multiple contractors set up a so-called “teaming arrangement,” they will either need to decide who will be the prime contractor that ultimately submits the proposal to the Government for the team or set up some other type of legal entity, such as a joint venture, that would submit the proposal, presumably with one company appointed by the group as the spokesman/agent for all. It is up to each individual offeror to evaluate the advantages for teaming arrangements.

- 11) Question - Since all awardees will be working cooperatively under the defined IPT within the prescribed ID/IQ vehicle, is there any possible added value to the government for multiple contractors to respond to this RFP as a team?

Answer - It is up to each individual offeror to evaluate the advantages for teaming arrangements. Also, see number 6) above.

- 12) Question – What is the NAICS code for small businesses under this RFP?

Answer – The NAICS Code is 541710, which is entitled “Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences”

- 13) Question – What is the small business size for this RFP?

Answer – The NAICS Code of 541710 has a small business size standard of 500 people.

- 14) Question – Will there be the same number of basic awards as task order 0001 awards?

Answer – Yes.

15) Question – What are the anticipated solicitation release and award dates for the first developmental task orders (orders beyond 0001)?

Answer – The first developmental order solicitation is scheduled for release in the first Quarter of FY 2005 with the anticipated award date in the second Quarter of FY 2005.

16) Question – Is the “Systems Integrator” task anticipated to be awarded with the first developmental task orders?

Answer – A Systems Integration or Systems Engineer task similar to that under Sample Task vi is intended to be solicited and awarded under the same time frame as the first development task order. However, the exact scheduling and grouping of program deliverables and future development task order solicitations are still being evaluated.

17) Question – Will the industry participants included in the IPT formed from the task order 0001 awards participate in the proposal review for developmental task orders?

Answer – No

18) Question – If an offeror proposes to the RFP for basic award addressing the “Systems Integrator” sample task in their proposal can they receive a developmental award for developmental tasks other than systems integration?

Answer – Yes. All offerors who receive a basic contract award will be eligible to compete for any future task order solicitations under this RFP regardless of the sample task subject chosen for their basic contract proposal. Also, see number 31).

19) Question – Who is the government’s system integrator and what are the major distinctions between the government integrator and the industry integrator selected under a future task order?

Answer – The current plan is to have NRL serve as the lead systems engineer during the TD phase in direct partnership with the industry selected systems integrator. Under this plan, this role will shift solely to Industry during the SDD phase. Also, see number 16).

20) Question – Who has “Performance Responsibility” during the TD phase?

Answer – For the overall performance of the system during the TD phase, it is the Government’s intension to have NRL carry the overall performance responsibility (i.e., Total System Performance Responsibility). In this situation, each development contractor will be responsible for the delivery of the systems/subsystems they were contracted for under each task order. However, the degree of involvement of the

Industry systems integrator/engineer during the TD phase has not yet been determined and will be discussed during the T.O. 0001 IPT meetings.

- 21) Question – (Statement) Systems integrator and systems engineer are not generally one in the same.

Response – True, in the RFP the systems integrator sample task is identifying duties and responsibilities generally defined for a systems engineer in an acquisition program. However, the revised Sample Task iv in the Final RFP will encompass the duties of both systems integration and systems engineering.

- 22) Question – If an offeror has identified or anticipates employing the services of a small business or other subcontractor do they have to be identified in the basic contract proposal to be eligible to participate.

Answer – No.

- 23) Question – The RFP identifies eight meetings as part of the IPT task. Where will these meetings be held? Hawaii?

Answer – The RFP identifies the D.C. Capital region as the anticipated area for IPT meetings; most likely NRL.

- 24) Question - The TTA and the RFP seem to have different requirement in some areas. Which requirement has precedence? In addition some of the requirements within the TTA itself differ. Do the requirements referenced in the text take precedence over the requirements identified in the tables?

Answer - Within the TTA, the numbers in the table should take precedence over the numbers provided elsewhere in the TTA. Any perceived disagreement between the TTA and RFP should be brought to the attention of the PCO ASAP.

- 25) Question - Will there be a requirement to firewall the experts who participate in Task Order 0001 and prevent them from being included in future development sub-task orders? What will be the rules governing the discussion of competition-sensitive information which the contractors may intend to submit in response to future delivery orders?

Answer - No, there is no firewall requirement since there is no requirement to discuss competition-sensitive information in the T.O. 0001 IPT order.

- 26) Question - Part of the evaluation criteria is stated as the extent the offeror demonstrates a willingness to enter into IWAs with other winning contractors. Please describe the scope and obligations of the referenced "IWAs".

Answer – The intent of the IWAs is to assure a free flow of information and coordination between the contractors developing systems and between them and the systems integrator contractor. This will be necessary to assure that all systems developed interoperate and that the contractors involved do not need a third party (the government) to assure that they coordinate and cooperate adequately in working together to accomplish the required interoperability. There is no intention in this requirement that contractors will have to share internal design information with other contractors to the point that intellectual property is compromised. However, in the event that some sharing of IP becomes necessary, the Government anticipates that the parties involved can negotiate and sign appropriate commercial non-disclosure agreements to protect the intellectual property.

27) Question - For Task Order 0001 Technical Proposal does ONR expect more than a list of key personnel, their capabilities, contractors experience and willingness to enter into IWAs?

Answer - No.

28) Question - The TTA indicates additional information will be supplied by another source. When will this be provided?

Answer - This information will not be provided during this proposal submission phase. This information will be made available to basic contract awardees for the initial development task order solicitation.

29) Question - Will ONR consider increasing the page count limitation to allow bidders the opportunity to provide more comprehensive descriptions of their capabilities under the Sample Task proposals (i.e. multiple sample tasks)?

Answer - ONR would like to keep the proposal page count to 50 pages for the award of these basic contract vehicles and small initial T.O. 0001 awards.

30) Question - Will ONR be setting time aside during Industry Day or soon thereafter to have “one on one” sessions with interested bidders?

Answer - No.

31) Question - Do the six Sample Tasks in Section L represent the Government’s anticipated execution or breakout of work under this effort? And, will the system integration be competed and awarded as a separate task order?

Answer – This breakout demonstrates one way the Government could breakout tasks for future solicitations under this effort. It does not necessarily represent the Government’s plan of execution of future task order requirements. The Government may provide for task order solicitation(s) that segregate(s) the system into major subsystems different than those outlined in the sample tasks or during the Industry

Day. This segregation could allow for individual awards of major subsystems to various basic contract awardees or an award to one basic contract awardee for the entire system. Additionally, the presented "division of labor" (that is, those items delivered by industry, and those delivered by the Navy for the TD phase) outlined during the Industry Day may change accordingly. The systems integration task is currently intended to be competed and awarded as a separate task order. However, this could also change upon determination of the plan for solicitation of the development tasks.

32) Question - What is the required instantaneous bandwidth for the MFEW arrays?

Answer – This information will not be provided during this proposal submission phase, but will be provided to basic contract awardees for the first development task order solicitation.

33) Question- Concerning the TTA, pending release of classified details of the HGHS requirements, will a typical/representative HGHS Signal be provide for use in the Proposal?

Answer – This information will not be provided during this proposal submission phase, but will be provided to basic contract awardees for the first development task order solicitation.

34) Question- Concerning the TTA, the instantaneous bandwidth (IBW) "X" not identified in either TTA or RFP. Will these numbers be provided with the RFP, or if not, when or how?

Answer – This information will not be provided during this proposal submission phase, but will be provided to basic contract awardees for the first development task order solicitation.

35) Question - I understand from the briefing that information for the baseline system, AMRFC, is also available. How can I be provided this information?

Answer – This was provided under slides at Industry Day.

36) Question - Under Overall Project, (B)1.starting on page 65, "Offerer should provide a broad description of its intended technical approach to provide an overall MFEW/ES system , key subsystems, or integration work under any ensuing contract and," The contractor is further asked and/or requested to "describe how he will provide for the following elements under an overall MFEW/ES system or subsystems under this effort." Pages 66-71 address the specific system element task descriptions and related requirements. Our company may not be able to address each of the elements, if we interpret the RFP's intent, to your satisfaction because we are a hardware-independent organization. Specifically, we do not develop and manufacture hardware systems and their respective components. Our company's credentials are as a computer/software

architecture and large-scale software developer/integration contractor. Is it possible that a company with these credentials (without a teaming or subcontracting arrangement with a hardware developer/supplier) can qualify for a basic contract and resulting T.O. 0001 award under this effort?

Answer – The major thrust of this RFP is systems development, which includes hardware development. A task order solicitation for only software is not anticipated. Based on this, your company's ability to qualify for a basic contract award without a teaming/subcontracting arrangement with a hardware developer would be unlikely. If your company teams with a company with hardware capabilities, its chances of qualifying for a basic contract award would increase.

- 37) Question - Please consider making available an opportunity to visit your library/repository where our representatives may review important program reports, plans, etc. describing the important work accomplished, since the late 1990s, and leading up to the present.

Answer- Such a library/repository does not exist.

- 38) Question - According to the instructions in these two sections, the entire Staff Qualifications element, which is to consist of resumes and other narrative as applicable, does not count towards the 50-page limit. Is this understanding correct?

Answer- The final RFP will be revised to indicate that resumes attached to the technical proposal will not be included in the page count. Any narrative provided for this section would be counted in the page limit.

- 39) Question - Please define "lower level technical and administrative personnel". (pg. 71 of RFP)

Answer – Lower level technical and administrative personnel would be considered those personnel on a project that the offeror does not consider key personnel, upper level management or upper level key personnel. Further definition is not considered to be necessary since this statement is merely trying to convey that it is important for the Government to see variety and completeness of the proposed staff for the overall project.

- 40) Question - What is the relationship/precedence of the TTA to the RFP, and will some or all of it be incorporated into the resulting IDIQ contract?

Answer – Should there be any conflict between the TTA and RFP, the language in the RFP takes precedence over the TTA. The TTA will not be included as an attachment to the basic contracts. However, the TTA will be the basis from which a requirements document is generated for the first development solicitation under this effort.

- 41) Question - With all the emphasis, priority and discussion on an ES system/subsystem that will transition in 2008, why do the 3 goals given in the SOW (att 1) for MFEW/ES not include the ES subsystem (ie. Receivers and Processors)?

Answer – These goals are being rewritten for the Final RFP.

- 42) The TTA and the draft RFP stress the importance of providing an EW/ES subsystem to DD(X) in 2009. The program plan presented at Industry Day appears to concentrate on demonstrating new multifunction antenna technology, and presumes subsequent initiation of SDD in 2008. Is there a plan to accelerate SDD of the EW/ES subsystem to reduce the risk of integration and installation into the first DD(X) and/or SEWIP? Will this plan be executed on the subject IDIQ?

Answer – Yes, the current plan for execution of the SDD phase will be accelerated to meet delivery of the system(s) to DDX in FY 2009. Our RFP gives the Government the capability to execute this accelerated SDD phase under the resulting contracts.

- 43) The draft RFP states "The Offeror of this task shall perform all tasks associated with that of a system integrator including coordination of all activities described in Sample Tasks 1 through 5 above, integration of all subsystems, and test and deployment of the MFEW/ES system as a whole. Furthermore, the systems integrator shall develop and provide the equipment and software components that are common to, and necessary for the operation of the MFEW/ES system as a whole." The Government noted during Industry Day that the term "system integrator" was applied to Subtask 6 in error. Further, the Government stated that NRL would be the MFEW/ES system integrator, and hold responsibility for the task as written, up to and including MFEW system delivery in accordance with the schedule requirements established in the AMRFC/EW Technology Transition Agreement. The Government clarified the intent of Subtask 6 as an offering of "system engineering support" (i.e., level of effort support) to the Government system integrator for the Technology Development Phase. Will the RFP be amended to reflect this direction? Also, please clarify the deliverables anticipated for products and engineering services provided by the Offeror under Subtask 6.

Answer: See Question 21) above. The Sample Task iv is being rewritten but will include both systems integration and systems engineering tasks.

- 44) Question - Has the RF architecture been determined?

Answer - No, alternative architectures will be evaluated on the basis of cost and performance (including multi functionality) during the solicitation for the initial development task order(s).

45) Question: On page 68 of RFP under paragraph iii) entitled "Analog Receiver Development ", the frequency variables "F1" and "F4" are called out but are not defined anywhere. Please indicate what these variables mean?

Answer: F1 is the bottom of the mid band and F4 is the top of the high band.

46) Question: What is in the Interface Working Agreement (IWA) referenced in the RFP? Can you email me a copy or where I can obtain one?

Answer: There is no specified format for the IWA. See Q&A number 26) to see scope of what the IWA is to cover.

47) Question: Page 64 of the RFP states that the proposal font size is 12-point. May we use smaller font size in illustrative segments such as charts, figures, tables?

Answer: Smaller font for illustrative segments such as charts, figures, and tables may be used.

48) Question: In the RFP it indicates that resumes for "no more than four people in any particular labor category..." Do you have a list of standard government labor categories?

Answer: We do not have a list of standard government labor categories to propose to. Offerors should propose their own labor categories.

49) Question: Can we use 11x17 fold out pages and if so, how many pages of the page limit will that consume??

Answer: No, this size paper can not be used. Reference paragraph 6) of Section L.15 to find the required page size and other format requirements.

50) Question: Are the cover pages and the Table of Content pages included in the page count?

Answer: Yes, these pages are included in the page count. The only items not included in the Technical Proposal page count (in accordance with paragraph 6) of Section L.15) are resumes and the segregable section for Commitment to Small Business.